

D&D Subgroup Highlights  
May 12, 1998

This meeting was held in the ETB Spokane River Room starting at 9:00 a.m.

Risk Assessment and Management

Mark Robershotte, PNNL, gave a viewgraph presentation on work he has been doing for the Hanford Site, including TWRS, on risk assessment and management. This information was also presented at the Exchange '97 meeting in December. Active risk management throughout a project's life-cycle can decrease the likelihood of cost overruns, schedule delays and poor system quality. A risk is defined as an undesirable event or situation that has a significant likelihood of occurrence. Risk is usually measured by combining the likelihood of the occurrence with the seriousness of its impact on the project. In the past, risk management focussed on ES&H risks primarily using regulations and standards. Management of risks was not done in an organized fashion. Today, risk management can be done in a systematic way based on the use of data for the entire project's life-cycle. The approach should be to involve the project managers and use specialists to assist them.

Project risk management is still evolving and tool development is still continuing. The DoD is ahead of the DOE in the use of risk management. A program of risk management has a programmatic focus with careful review of all activities and plans to identify and assess risks and to develop ways to handle them. Senior management should focus attention on the critical risks, while all managers should review risks at their level. The goal is to avoid managing risks by firefighting after the fact. Not every risk needs to be managed, only the significant ones. Too much overhead in the risk management system will cause it to fail. Making management of risk part of a manager's normal duties will work better than hiring staff to do the work.

The risk management process consists of three tasks: risk assessment (identification and screening), risk analysis (not always quantitative), and risk handling (avoidance and control efforts). When quantifying risks it's better to keep it simple and not be too detailed. Need to focus on the critical risks only. The critical risks are those requiring intensive management attention because consequences are serious or the visibility is high. A critical risk management list can be put together that shows only the critical risks and includes summary data and the overall status of each risk. Also, in this list are specific actions and who has the responsibility for each risk. This list can be reviewed at regular meetings and updated accordingly. Also, as part of this list, the risks can be classified or rated according to a consistent scheme that assesses the likelihood or probability of the risk occurring and the consequences of it happening. Any risk handling actions should be examined using a structured approach, such as cost/benefit and then followed over time. Risks can be handled in one of the following four ways: avoidance, transfer or sharing the risk with others, controlling by reducing the probability or consequence of the risk, or accepting the risk and its consequences. These handling actions can be examined in a structured process and fallback plans prepared for any residual risks that arise. Responsibility for

handling risks should be on staff in whose area the risks reside. Progress on handling each risk should be reviewed periodically and data for actions assigned. Those risks that pose a major threat or where handling is inadequate should be identified, assessed, and monitored often.

Effective risk management requires a structured and systematic approach. Regular risk meetings should be held and be brief and focussed. When handling risks, you need to watch for interactions across programs to avoid suboptimization of results. A simple and qualitative risk management program is effective and managing risks should be accepted as part of managing any program. Most of the TWRS risks were non-technical in nature (regulatory, political, etc.). Risk management tools can help in developing project schedules, budgets, etc.

#### DDFA Mid-Year Review Feedback

The D&D Focus Area (DDFA) mid-year review was held in Morgantown, West Virginia on May 5-7, 1998. Presentations were made by each Large-Scale Demonstration and Deployment Project (LSDDP) team, including the C-Reactor group. In addition to the three continuing LSDDPs, the four new LSDDPs starting up in FY98 were introduced and discussed. The four new demos are the LANL glovebox D&D, the Mound tritium facility clean-up, the SRS Fuel Fabrication Facility deactivation and the INEEL Fuel Storage Canals and Associated Underwater and Underground Facilities decommissioning. After the LSDDPs were presented, all other projects were given 30 minutes to present their work. In addition, the Cross-Cutting Focus Areas presented their applicable work at the meeting. One of the projects presented was the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI) going on at Hanford. A two-day meeting is now taking place to kick-off the CDI work. A meeting on the third day was held to impart lessons learned from the three on-going LSDDPs to the four new teams. The Corps of Engineers also presented information on cost estimating at the meeting.

Bob Julian stated that Steve Pulsford's presentation on C-Reactor was very well done and better than the other two on-going LDDP presentations. The C-Reactor team also had one of its ICT members there. Bob also talked to other attendees about laser cutters and metal melters. There are a number of melters in the DOE complex and Bob is continuing to find more information on these.

#### Canyon Disposition Initiative Update

Jerry White stated that EM-30, -40, -50, and -60 have all provided funding for this effort this year. The major focus is on characterization in order to make a decision on how to proceed with various alternatives. EM-50 will pay for the technology-related activities. There will be a meeting soon with the DDFA on out-year funding of CDI. The two-day kickoff meeting now underway is for the Technology Working Group to identify, select and screen technologies to be tested. There are 15 or so people involved in this meeting, including representatives from regulators, stakeholders, contractors, DOE-RL, the DDFA, INEEL, SRS, and Florida International University. Kim Koegler is the PI for the project and Shannon Saget is the EM-50 representative. This is a unique project because all the EM programs are working together both at Hanford and across the country.

## Miscellaneous Updates

Greg Berlin talked about the S&T Needs Process for this year. An updated schedule was distributed to all subgroup members. The PHMC is working with their contractors on the needs already. A draft of all the needs will be finished by the end of June. This will be discussed with the subgroup in July. There will be a review of the STCG Science needs at an EMSP meeting in Washington D.C. on June 23-24. At a later meeting in Chicago the science needs will be examined to see if they are still relevant.

The call for proposals issued by EM-53 for the Accelerated Site Technology Deployment (ASTD) program was distributed to the subgroup members. Paul Hunt, DDFA, warned that any D&D ASTD proposals funded would be competing against the DDFA proposals. BHI has identified one proposal and will have a meeting on this next week. The proposal would be to deploy technologies demonstrated at C-Reactor to other reactors. Any D&D proposals for the ASTD will be reviewed at the next D&D subgroup meeting.

A draft copy of the BWHC laser deployment strategy for Hanford was distributed to subgroup members. The laser may be moved from the 324 Building to LANL for them to work on it. Funding for the LANL work is not here yet. Dave Langstaff said to be sure to help keep track of the time and costs to take down and set up the laser system to be able to compare with the truck-mounted time and costs to be analyzed later.

Information about the SPECTRUM '98 conference to be held on September 13-18 in Denver was distributed to subgroup members. No word has been received as to how many people from Hanford can attend on DOE-RL funding. One idea was to move the closing ceremonies for the C-Reactor to align them with SPECTRUM thus allowing participants from out of town to attend both in one trip.

The next D&D Subgroup meeting will be June 9 at 9:00 a.m. in the ETB Spokane River Room.

Attendees

Gary Ballew	PREC	946-0611
Greg Berlin	FDH	372-4352
Ron Borisch	BWHC	372-3382
Dennis Brown	DOE-RL	372-4030
Sue Garrett	PNNL	372-4266
Jim Goodenough	DOE-ER	376-0893
Bob Julian	Ecology	736-5702
Dave Langstaff	DOE-RL	376-5580
Terry Lucke	BWHC	373-5317
Steve Weakley	PNNL	372-4275
Det Wegener	HAMMER-FDH	373-2021
Jerry White	BHI	372-9724